

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the patent to Sakai in view of the patent to Bosman.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the patent to Sakai in view of the patent to Miller.

The claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112.

At the same time the Examiner indicated that claims 4, 5 and 7-8 were not rejected over the art.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds for the rejection of the claims over the art, applicant has canceled claim 4 and introduced its features into claim 1. Also, the language of claim 1 and claim 4 have been amended as required by the Examiner.

It is believed that claim 1 which now contains the subject matter of the original claims 1 and 4 should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

Claims 2, 3, and 6 are dependent on the amended claim 1 and share its presumably allowable features. Claims 5 and 7 have been amended to depend on claim 1, and they also share its presumably allowable features, while claims 8-10 depend directly or indirectly on claim 5.


It is believed that all claims currently on file should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue.

Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233